DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 870 HE 017 593

AUTHOR Stetson, Kenneth W.
TITLE University without Walls: A Comparison of Student, Faculty, and Staff Perceptions at Selected Institutions.
INSTITUTION Interversitas, Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 89p.; Shortened version of a Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bachelors Degrees; Comparative Analysis; *External Degree Programs; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Nontraditional Education; *Open Universities; Private Colleges; Program Evaluation; School Surveys; State Colleges; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS Antioch College West; Chicago State University IL; Loretto Heights College CO; Northeastern Illinois University; Stephens College MO; University of Massachusetts; University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

The University Without Walls (UWW) programs at seven colleges were examined to identify common programmatic features and to determine both student and faculty/staff views of this educational endeavor. Attention was focused on the degree-granting process at the institutions. A total of 513 student questionnaires and 190 faculty/staff questionnaires were evaluated in 1978. Research concerns included: programmatic differences among the institutions, differences between public and private UWW institutions, academic degree delivery systems, staffing pattern for selected UWW programs, length of time required to complete a baccalaureate degree, comparative academic quality, and participation in UWW. For each institution, information was also collected on UWW student characteristics (ethnic composition, sex distribution, age distribution) along with the highest degree held by teaching faculty, academic rank distributions, and teacher characteristics. Separate institutional analyses were conducted for the following seven schools: Antioch College/West, Chicago State University, Loretto Heights College, University of Massachusetts, University of Minnesota, Northeastern Illinois University, and Stephens College. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NOV 5 1979

INTERVERSITAS

ED247870

Kenneth W. Stetson

UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS: A COMPARISON OF STUDENT, FACULTY, AND STAFF PERCEPTIONS AT SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kenneth W. Stetson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ERIC

Kenneth W. Stetson

UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS: A COMPARISON OF STUDENT, FACULTY, AND STAFF PERCEPTIONS AT SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Published by:

INTERVERSITAS: A World Association of
Experimenters in Postsecondary Education

5500 North St. Louis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60625

August, 1979

Copyright © 1979 by Kenneth Winslow Stetson

Printed in the United States of America. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews. For information address INTERVERSITAS, 5500 N. St. Louis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60625

INTRODUCTION

INTERVERSITAS was founded in January, 1977, as a project of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, Cincinnati, Ohio, in collaboration with Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, where it is housed. Subtitled a World Association of Experimenters in Postsecondary Education, INTERVERSITAS now consists of several hundred faculty members, administrators, students, and other interested persons in thirty-five countries. The purpose of the organization is to assist individual agents of change in post-compulsory education to become more effective in their work through a growing network of information, mutual support, and active collaboration.

In its first two and two-thirds years of life, INTERVERSITAS has published five newsletters a year and an annual indexed membership directory. It has also assisted individual members in job searches, provided books and journals of interest to the membership at a discount, and begun local face-to-face chapters of the association. The publication of Kenneth W. Stetson's University Without Walls: A Comparison of Student, Faculty, and Staff Perceptions at Selected Institutions as the first INTERVERSITAS monograph, however, signals the beginning of a new venture--making relevant writings by members available to both the membership and others at a modest cost. Should this initiative prove financially and administratively viable, we shall attempt to produce monographs of this type--normally no longer than 100 pages--at the rate of several a year. Therefore, INTERVERSITAS members are encouraged to submit suitable manuscripts, which may be reworkings of other materials to fit our format and potential readership.

Concerning the present work, it was originally written in a longer version as Mr. Stetson's 1978 doctoral dissertation in Curriculum and Instruction at Loyola University of Chicago. Recently named Assistant Provost at Northeastern Illinois University, Mr. Stetson has served the institution since 1971 in several capacities--as Graduate Admission Officer, Assistant Professor of History, Associate Director of Program Development, and Assistant to the Provost. Most significantly for the purpose of this study, he was Coordinator of Northeastern's University Without Walls program from 1973 to 1976.

Given the ongoing (and much-needed) attention to the evaluation of all academic programs, especially nontraditional programs, INTERVERSITAS is therefore pleased at this time to offer Mr. Stetson's research study on selected aspects of the University Without Walls as the association's first monograph. I hope it will fill a useful space on the shelf of professional literature devoted to alternative postsecondary education.

Reynold Feldman,
Director of INTERVERSITAS

Chicago
August, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

I. NATURE OF THE STUDY 1

Introduction 1
Understanding Nontraditional Education. . 2
Methodology 5
Survey Instrument 9
Development and Design of Questionnaire . 9

II. SURVEY OF THE PROGRAMS 11

The Survey 11
Programmatic Differences 13
Differences in Public and Private UWW Institutions 19
Academic Degree Delivery Systems . . . 23
Staffing Pattern for Selected UWW Programs 27
Length of Time Required to Complete a Baccalaureate Degree 33
Comparative Academic Quality 36
Participation in UWW 39
Summary 42

III. INTERPRETATIONS OF THE DATA 44

Introduction 44
Aggregate Analysis 44
Institutional Analysis 48
Antioch College/West 49
Chicago State University 49
Loretto Heights College 51
University of Massachusetts . . . 55
University of Minnesota 59
Northeastern Illinois University . . 62
Stephens College 66
Summary 70

IV. CONCLUSIONS 72

Personnel in UWW 72
Students in UWW 72
Academic Aspects of UWW 73
UWW-Related Topics for Study 75

REFERENCES 79

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Summary of Questionnaires	12
2.	Student Ethnic Comparison	14
3.	UWW Students by Sex Distribution	15
4.	Age Distribution by Institution	16
5.	Ethnic Distribution by Institution	16
6.	Highest Degree Held by Teaching Faculty	18
7.	Comparison of Academic Rank	19
8.	Selected UWW Faculty/Staff Demographic Comparison: Public and Private	20
9.	UWW Student Demographic Comparison: Public and Private	22
10.	Selected UWW Faculty/Staff Demographic Characteristics by Academic Delivery System	24
11.	Student Demographic Characteristics by Academic Degree Delivery System	26
12.	Selected UWW Faculty/Staff Characteristics: Core Staff and Decentralized Advisement	29
13.	Student Demographic Characteristics by Staffing Pattern	32
14.	Comparison of Extended Length of Time to Graduate in UWW	34
15.	Previous Formal College Credit Earned by UWW Students	35
16.	Faculty/Staff Opinion of Academic Quality	37
17.	UWW Quality Viewed by Non-Involved Professionals	38

18. Student Opinion of Academic Quality in UWW . . . 39

19. Faculty/Staff Opinion of Involvement of Off-Campus, Non-Collegiate Personnel 40

20. UWW Student Employment and Relationship to UWW Program 41

21. Aggregate Faculty/Staff and Student Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 46

22. Chicago State University Student Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 50

23. Loretto Heights College Faculty/Staff Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 52

24. Loretto Heights College Student Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 54

25. University of Massachusetts Faculty/Staff and Student Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW . . . 56

26. University of Massachusetts Faculty/Staff Opinion of Academic Quality in UWW 57

27. University of Massachusetts Student Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 58

28. University of Minnesota Faculty/Staff Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 59

29. University of Minnesota Student Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 61

30. Northeastern Illinois University Faculty/ Staff Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW . . . 63

31. Northeastern Illinois University Faculty/ Staff Opinion of Academic Quality in UWW . . . 65

32. Stephens College Faculty/Staff and Student Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 66

33. Stephens College Faculty/Staff Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 67

34. Stephens College Student Opinion of Selected Issues in UWW 69

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Nontraditional educational endeavors in higher education are not new; but in the past decade, such efforts in American higher education have grown steadily. Some institutions have been entirely dedicated to nontraditional approaches leading to baccalaureate degrees. New York's Empire State Program, for example, enrolled more than 3,300 students during the 1975-76 academic year at more than one hundred separate sites throughout the state.[1] More than 5,500 people graduated from the New York State Regents Program between 1972 and 1977.[2] Some nontraditional educational programs have also been tried on a nationwide basis.

One example of a nationwide nontraditional effort is that of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities (UECU) which launched the University Without Walls (UWW) program in 1971. UWW was a nationwide network of baccalaureate degree programs housed on fourteen specific campuses of Union (the common name of UECU) member institutions.

---

[1] College and University Enrollment in New York State: Fall, 1976; Preliminary Report (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1976), p.10.

[2] Rex Reports: Newsletter of the Regents External Degrees (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1977), p.7.

With financial support from the Ford Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education, each cooperating institution received approximately $40,000 over a three-year period.[3]

Despite this apparent common background, the Union's University Without Walls network was a mixed collection of programs--having almost as many differences as similarities. In an attempt to assess strengths and weaknesses of this educational experiment, seven of the largest and oldest UWW were examined--Antioch West, Chicago State University, Loretto Heights College, Northeastern Illinois University, Stephens College, University of Massachusetts, and the University of Minnesota. There were two purposes in the examination: first, to identify common programmatic features which transcended individual programs and, second, to examine both student and faculty/staff views of this educational endeavor.

Understanding Nontraditional Education

London has pointed out that it is important to identify common elements in nontraditional programs "that would establish in the public's mind a view of nontraditional education not dissimilar from the view of traditional education."[4] In addition, with changing enrollment patterns and growing cooperative relationships between institutions of higher education and business and government agencies, innovative ideas are

---

[3]Ernest Boyer and George Keller, "The Big Move to Non-Campus Colleges," Saturday Review 54 (July 17, 1971): 48.

[4]Herbert I. London,"The Case for Nontraditional Education," Change 8 (June 1976): 29.

frequently part of contemporary curricular change and adaptation. Not all change is necessarily good, however--a point that Kellans made in 1974.

> One can applaud much of the attempt to innovate at the college level. However...all of the educational technology, new delivery systems of education, self-paced programming, and modular packaging cannot be better than the content which is conveyed....Overzealous innovation attempts that ignore these crucial functions are bound, in the long run, to become vacuous.[5]

Since the University Without Walls effort is but one of many facets of the holistic term "nontraditional education," it would be useful to examine the breadth of that term as applied to higher education. Gould and Cross define nontraditional education as "a group of changing educational patterns caused by changing needs of society," while Cross and Valley define it as the "explicit recognition that education should be measured by what a student knows rather than how or where he learns it."[7] The Carnegie Commission Study on Nontraditional Study concludes that "nontraditional study is more an attitude than a system and thus can never be defined except tangentially."[8] More recently Knowles

---

[5]Samuel E. Kellans, "Knowledge Renewal with Innovation," College and University Journal 13 (May 1974): 5.

[6]Samuel Gould and K. Patricia Cross, eds., Exploration in Nontraditional Study (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. xv.

[7]K. Patricia Cross, John Valley and Associates, Planning Nontraditional Programs: An Analysis of the Issues of Postsecondary Education (San Fransico: Jossey-Bass, 1974), p. 1.

[8]Samuel B. Gould, Chairman, Commission on Nontraditional Study, Diversity by Design (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. xv.

pointed out that "'non-traditional study'...has a negative flavor and provides no clues as to the territory it is intended to describe."[9]

Collegiate nontraditional study often culminates in a baccalaureate degree. As a result, the term "external degree" is often associated with college-level nontraditional study. However, external degree programs represent only a small part of the total nontraditional education concept. A much larger part of nontraditional study is associated with nondegree educational pursuits, commonly referred to as adult or continuing education. Houle provides a basic definition of an external degree.

> An external degree is one awarded to an individual on the basis of some program of preparation (devised either by himself or by an educational institution) which is not centered on traditional patterns of residential collegiate or university study.[10]

Shulman has noted that "the phrase 'external degree' does not refer to any standardized type of degree program, but is a rubric for a variety of programs designed to deal with acknowledged needs in higher education."[11] Splaver has defined external degrees as being awarded on the "basis of all or most of the credits or competencies having been accumulated or acquired 'externally' beyond the college campus rather

---

[9]Malcolm S. Knowles, "Non-Traditional Study: Issues and Resolutions," Adult Education 8 (February 1975): 232.

[10]Cyril O. Houle, The External Degree (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. 14.

[11]Carol H. Shulman, "A Look at External Degree Structures," Research Currents: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (November 1972): 1.

than 'internally'on the college campus in traditional classrooms or laboratories."[12]

There are several features usually found in external degree programs. Generally these programs are designed to serve working adults who often find traditional residency requirements insurmountable. These programs also assume that learning does not need to be confined to a single location or to any specific block of time. Further, availability, individualized curricular options and accessibility are features of most external degree programs.

University Without Walls is a specific kind of external degree program. UWW is not a copyrighted term and there are many programs which now are identified by that acronym. However, for the purposes of this examination, only the seven programs already identified will be studied in detail.

Methodology

The essential component of the field study was a questionnaire systematically developed by the author. Since UWW programs use different methods of recordkeeping, fiscal accounting, reporting faculty involvement, and other such administrative matters, it was necessary to design a survey instrument which allowed for the collection of broad-based data needed for the study. An examination of current UWW records would not provide consistent information nor would such an examination afford any possible analysis of the selected UWW programs. Therefore, it was necessary to design a questionnaire which would supply appropriate data

---

[12]Sarah Splaver, Nontraditional College Routes to Careers (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975), p. 174.

needed for the study. As Wrightstone et al. observed, "questionnaires are appropriate also for securing data which are not readily available or not conveniently assembled."[13] Since the purpose of the study was to examine the effectiveness of each of the seven UWW programs, Corey's emphasis on the practicability of field-based research is appropriate as further support for the methodology.[14]

Prior to beginning the study, the author reviewed available data regarding UWW efforts, but, unfortunately, very little information was available. Gould stressed the availability of UWW in existing institutions when he noted "some nontraditional programs such as University Without Walls are already being developed for college-age students within existing institutions."[15] Nelson, however, called attention to the more unique contribution of certain UWW programs which were competency-based.

> A few institutions, such as the University Without Walls at the University of Minnesota and Antioch-West in San Francisco, have had the courage to break the credit hour barrier and to define their curricular and degree requirements in terms other than credit or semester hours. In these few cases such conversion of experience to academic credit hours are not appropriate, but the credit-hour seems largely entrenched as the coin of the academic realm.[16]

---

[13]J. Wayne Wrightstone; Joseph Justman; Irving Robbins, Evaluation in Modern Education (New York: American Book Company, 1956), p. 138.

[14]Steven M. Corey, Action Research to Improve School Practices (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1953), p. 142.

[15]Gould, Diversity by Design, p. 4.

[16]Fred A. Nelson, "Has the Time Gone for an External Degree?" Journal of Higher Education 45 (March 1974): 180.

The Ford Foundation noted that UWW "transcends the individual campuses with their limitations on viewpoint and politics, but avoids centralized control or uniformity imposed from outside."[17] Levine and Weingart pointed to the student emphasis in UWW as one of its essential contributions to nontraditionalism. "Today, much of the effort in student-centered curriculum is being spent on projects like University Without Walls...which use the world as their campus and are completely student oriented."[18] Minimal residency requirements were the feature of UWW which Adams cited as being valuable.

> There are several institutions--The University Without Walls, Empire State College of New York, and Minnesota's Metropolitan State College, for example--for which it is possible to get a degree without ever attending a single class on campus. The institutions, in fact, have no campuses of their own.[19]

Of course, not everyone was convinced that UWW was necessarily the best answer to contemporary educational needs in higher education. London makes a strong criticism of the UECU/UWW network when he questioned the educational validity of awarding "life experience" credit in haphazard fashion in some UWW programs.[20] Assessing nonclassroom learning was a frequently identified difficulty in nontraditional educational programs.

---

[17]Ronald Gross, Higher/Wider/Education: A Report on Open Learning (New York: Ford Foundation, 1976), p. 16.

[18]Arthur Levine and John Weingart, Reform of Undergraduate Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. 97.

[19]Velma A. Adams, "Adult Education:Where the Bread and Action Are," College Management 8 (April 1973): 9.

[20]Herbert London, "University Without Walls: Reform or Rip-Off?" Saturday Review, September 16, 1972, pp. 62-65.

Another factor to consider was quality or academic standards of non-traditional programs.[21] Who assesses what was another important issue.

Haberman also addressed several issues related to competency assessments and awarding credit for nonclassroom learning.[22] He raised fifteen specific questions including who should award credit, how such credit should be applied to a baccalaureate program once awarded, and who should be eligible to receive such credit awards. A more thorough treatment of issues surrounding competency-based undergraduate programs can be found in Trivett.[23] He questioned the long-term impact of such programs, however, because he felt they may be too complex to implement. "This complexity is a result of the attempt to analyze what an institution is trying to do, to translate that purpose into broad goals, and make operational in statements of competencies that can be measured."[24] Stecher was critical of the College Level Examination Program (CLEP).[25]

---

[21]Richard B. Heydinger, "The Assessment of Student Performance: A Model & the Reforms," Paper Presented at the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, 25 March 1975.

[22]Martin Haberman, "New Entry Requirements and New Programs for College Students," in Allan C. Ornstein and Steven I. Miller, ed., Policy Issues in Education (Lexington, Mass.: D.C.Heath and Company, 1976), pp. 95-107.

[23]David A. Trivett, Competency Programs in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 7, 1975).

[24]Ibid., p. 63.

[25]Carl A. Stecher, "CLEP and the Great Credit Giveaway," Change 9 (March 1977): 36-41.

Survey Instrument

The study concentrated on the degree-granting process at the seven selected institutions. As part of the study, students, faculty, and staff members were asked to complete questionnaires. (A staff person was defined as a member of the institution's professional staff whose responsibility in the UWW program was not direct instruction or academic advisement. Specifically, such duties could include student career counseling and advising, facilitating student-related problems--either in the program or at the institution--and programmatic administration.) The questionnaires were designed with a number of subscales and items so that the data collected could be further analyzed, especially comparing student and faculty/staff impressions of each program.

Seven institutions were selected to be examined, four public and three private--public institutions: Chicago State University, Northeastern Illinois University, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Minnesota; private institutions: Antioch College/West, Loretto Heights College, and Stephens College. Each of these institutions was selected because they had operated a UWW program since 1971, the year the UECU-sponsored UWW effort began nationally, and each offered its own degree rather than the UECU consortium degree.

Development and Design of Questionnaire

The questionnaires were developed by the author over an eight-month period. Each questionnaire was divided into four sections in order to separate discrete data. The demographic sections asked the respondent to provide basic information regarding both personal and programmatic background. In the second section the respondent was asked to provide basic

factual programmatic information. The third section asked the respondent to give opinions regarding personal experience in UWW. Finally, each respondent was asked to give opinions about statements from an "ideal" standpoint, assuming they could design their own "UWW-type" degree program. Sections three and four (the opinion sections) of each questionnaire were identical, thus allowing for a comparative analysis of each UWW program from both a student and faculty/staff perspective.

The validity and reliability of sections three and four (opinion sections) were made through a series of analyses which will not be discussed here. However, the complete validity and reliability process is available from the author and should be requested by anyone interested in these measures.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE PROGRAMS

The Survey

The student and faculty/staff questionnaires were sent to the participating UWW program directors in mid-November 1977 for mailing to potential respondents. Each questionnaire, introductory cover letter and return envelope was enclosed in another envelope and sealed prior to distribution to the program directors. This was done to facilitate the mailing from each program since only address labels and postage were then required. It was requested that the questionnaires be returned by November 30.

Unfortunately, the crush of holiday mail apparently delayed the delivery of the questionnaires and, as a consequence, it was necessary for the investigator to incorporate responses received through January 31, 1978, into the study. The most serious problem with the distribution of the questionnaires occurred at Antioch College/West where the cooperating program director left and the program's administrative offices changed location. These two events resulted in no distribution of the questionnaires outside the San Francisco area so the returns from that institution were limited. After talking with the acting director, the investigator estimated that only thirty student and twenty faculty questionnaires were distributed.

As indicated in Table 1 more than forty-four percent of the potential respondents returned the instrument, of which more than forty-two percent were usable.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRES

	Students			Faculty/Staff		
Institution	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Percent	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Percent
Antioch	30	11	36.7%	20	8	40.0%
Chicago St.	68	29	42.6	30	11	36.7
Loretto	116	42	36.2	30	14	46.7
U Mass	150	51	34.0	100	34	34.0
U Minn	213	82	38.5	100	40	40.0
N'eastern	105	55	52.4	75	50	66.7
Stephens	554	224	40.4	80	27	33.8
Subtotal	1236	494	40.0	435	184	42.3
Returned after deadline		19			6	
Unusable/incorrectly completed		7			3	
TOTAL RETURNED (n)		520	42.1		193	44.4

A recent questionnaire-based survey of part-time students in Illinois produced similar return rates. Of the 2,025 students enrolled in colleges and universities in the Illinois survey, 863, or 42.6 percent, responded. The response rate of this survey was enhanced by mailing follow-up materials to individuals who had not responded within two

weeks of the initial distribution of the questionnaire.[1] Although the investigator in the UWW survey did not employ a follow-up technique, the return rate is remarkably similar to the Illinois study. Further, it appears that the potential respondents in both studies were quite similar also--older, working adults active in higher education.

Programmatic Differences

Although the present research project was based upon an individual case study approach in each of the seven UWW programs, there were three factors which could affect the results if looked at in the aggregate. Specifically, there might be differences due to funding (private versus public), delivery of academic program (credit-based versus competency-based), or staffing model (core staff advisement versus decentralized advisement). An examination of different organizational or service factors was deemed necessary, and the demographic and programmatic portions of the student and faculty/staff questionnaires were utilized for this comparison.

In general this examination addresses several of the "organizational concepts" of the University Without Walls as identified in the First Report; specifically, who is served by these programs (students).[2] In other words, were UWW programs making opportunities

---

[1] "Summary of Data, Study of Illinois Adult Learners, Presented to Board of Higher Education," (Springfield, Ill.: Joint Education Committee of the Illinois Legislature, 1978). (Mimeographed.)

[2] University Without Walls: First Report (Yellow Springs, Ohio: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1972).

available in higher education while more traditional colleges and universities were not? According to federal statistics, the percentage of minority students attending four-year colleges and universities was 13.5 in fall, 1976.[3] In the seven UWW programs surveyed in the present study, the percentage of minority students was 23.4,and this data is summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2

STUDENT ETHNIC COMPOSITION
(Percent)

Ethnic Background	Nationwide, 1976[3] (n=215,890)	Selected UWW, 1977 (n=494)	UECU, 1977[4] (n=612)
Black	8.4%	10.9%	33.0%
Native American	0.9	8.9	17.0
Oriental	2.0	0.2	1.0
Spanish Surname	2.2	3.4	16.0
TOTAL	13.5	23.4	67.0

While the UWW data were from a small sample, they were representative of the ethnic student population served by the total UWW network as described by data in 1975.[5] The high proportion of minority students in the UECU-sponsored UWW programs was the result of the special outreach mission of these programs. Each UECU unit was designed to reach specific

---

[3]Chronicle of Higher Education, January 10, 1977, p. 12.

[4]Self Study in Progress Report (Cincinnati, Ohio: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1977), p. 23.

[5]Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, "Briefing Paper on UECU and UWW Prepared for the North Central Association Biennial Visit Evaluation Team," October, 1975, p. 3. (Mimeographed.)

ethnic groups,and these data reflect that in the aggregate. It appears that UWW was reaching different types of students, as was consistent with its original mission.

Each UWW program is an independent entity and thus has programmatic differences. However, there is similarity between the UWW programs when viewing the demographic data generally. For example, almost two-thirds of the student respondents in the present study were female (375 of 490). Although two programs (Loretto Heights and Stephens) show a somewhat skewed sexual distribution, the data were more similar than different. Table 3 presents the complete data.

TABLE 3

UWW STUDENTS BY SEX DISTRIBUTION

Institution	Female		Male	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Antioch West	6	54.5%	5	45.5%
Chicago State	21	72.4	8	21.6
Loretto Heights	36	85.7	6	14.3
Massachusetts	33	64.7	18	35.3
Minnesota	50	62.5	30	37.5
Northeastern	31	56.4	24	43.6
Stephens	198	88.4	24	11.6
TOTALS	375	76.5	115	23.5

The age distribution of students participating in the seven selected UWW programs is also similar. Table 4 summarizes this data.

TABLE 4

AGE DISTRIBUTION BY INSTITUTION

(Percent)

Institution	(n)	Under 18	18-22	23-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	Over 60
Antioch	(11)	-0-	9.1%	45.5%	36.3%	-0-	9.1%	-0-
Chicago St	(29)	-0-	-0-	3.4	24.1	51.8	20.7	-0-
Loretto	(42)	-0-	16.7	21.4	23.8	16.7	16.7	4.7
U Mass	(51)	-0-	7.8	31.4	27.5	15.7	17.6	-0-
U Minn	(82)	1.2	7.3	30.5	36.6	12.2	9.8	2.4
N'eastern	(55)	-0-	1.8	20.0	27.3	23.6	25.5	1.8
Stephens	(224)	-0-	1.3	10.8	37.9	29.9	19.2	0.9
TOTAL	(494)	0.2	4.5	18.4	33.4	24.3	17.8	1.4

Ethnic composition of students in the UWW programs participating in the study shows diversity. Although almost three-quarters of the total student population is Caucasian, there are many minority students in UWW. Table 5 presents this data by program.

TABLE 5

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION BY INSTITUTION

(Percent)

Institution	(n)	Black	Caucasian	Native American	Oriental	Spanish Surname	Other
Antioch	(11)	9.1%	81.8%	-0-	-0-	9.1%	-0-
Chicago St	(29)	48.4	44.8	3.4	-0-	-0-	3.4
Loretto	(41)	7.3	68.4	2.4	-0-	14.6	7.3
U Mass	(51)	9.8	72.5	11.8	-0-	3.9	2.0
U Minn	(82)	6.1	78.1	13.4	1.2	-0-	1.2
N'eastern	(55)	30.9	52.7	7.3	-0-	9.1	-0-
Stephens	(224)	4.0	84.4	9.4	-0-	1.3	0.9
TOTAL	(493)	10.9	74.8	8.9	0.2	3.5	1.7

While the faculty/staff response to the questionnaire was relatively small, it was useful to compare data from this group with national data. Since few systematic investigations have been made of UWW programs, examining information from the present study might provide some insight into the differences (or similarities) of the two groups. For example, 37.1 percent of the UWW faculty/staff respondents were female while the comparable proportion in all public and private four-year colleges and universities was 34.2 percent.[6]

A commonly held belief that professional educators involved with UWW tend to be younger, newer in the field, and lower ranked individuals on campus was not borne out by the data (see Table 7). Tenure was held by 74.8 percent of the UWW faculty respondents who identified teaching as their primary institutional responsibility. The 1976 national data for tenure in colleges and universities was 61 percent.[7] Again, it was not the purpose of this study to generalize regarding UWW programs and the totality of higher education. Nonetheless, these data do reflect on some of the generally held perceptions of UWW.and these comparisons should be viewed in that light.

Data from 1976 for four-year public and private colleges and universities and the data from the teaching faculty responses to the UWW

---

[6] Digest of Educational Statistics, 1976 Edition (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, (1977), p. 608.

[7] Chronicle of Higher Education, 20 September 1976, p. 18.

questionnaire are summarized in Table 6.

TABLE 6

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY TEACHING FACULTY
(Percent)

Degree	Nationwide, 1976[8] (n=371,581)	UWW, 1977 (n=183)
Doctorate	58.9%	76.7%
Masters	30.5	20.7
Professional	8.1	2.6
Bachelors	2.5	-0-

These data suggest that the academic preparation of teaching faculty was more heavily skewed toward doctoral degrees than faculty members in higher education in general.

The overall demographic data reflected a professional teaching preparation higher than might have been expected, especially considering the nontraditional enterprise UWW represented. Ewing, for example, cited institutional conservatism as a major impediment in curricular reform.[9] However, the faculty demographic data seemed to indicate that alternative curricular choices (e.g., UWW) can be supported by the more traditionally accepted academic leaders--professors with terminal degrees and tenure.

Academic rank was another means of comparing traditional institutional personnel with those people involved in these seven UWW programs.

---

8 Digest of Educational Statistics, 1976, p. 607

9 Wallace K. Ewing, "Reshaping the Curriculum: What Does It Really Mean?" College and University 49 (Spring 1974): 96-113.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC RANK
(Percent)

Rank	Nationwide, 1976[10] (n=289,000)	UWW, 1977 (n=183)
Professor	26.9%	31.6%
Associate Professor	28.8	28.2
Assistant Professor	32.4	25.6
Instructor	10.1	3.4
Other	1.8	.9
No Rank	-0-	10.3

Using these data, the personnel with teaching responsibilities involved in UWW programs have similar ranks with their nationally distributed counterparts. However, the national data are only for ranked faculty members, thereby eliminating the "no rank" category which UWW staff personnel frequently hold.

Differences in Public and Private UWW Institutions

Funding means and support levels frequently create programmatic and/or personnel differences between public and private (independent) institutions. To determine what differences might exist between these two types of institutions in the UWW sample, the faculty/staff responses to the demographic section of the questionnaire were divided into two groups according to the type of funding supporting each institution. Table 8 summarizes this demographic data.

---

10 The Condition of Education, 1976 (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1976), p. 137.

TABLE 8

SELECTED UWW FACULTY/STAFF DEMOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
(Percent)

Category	Private[a] (n=49)	Public[b] (n=135)	Category	Private[a] (n=49)	Public[b] (n=135)
Responsibility			**Tenure**		
Teaching	46.9%	69.4%	Yes	42.2%	61.4%
UWW Staff	46.9	12.7	No	57.8	38.6
Other	6.2	17.9			
			Academic Rank		
Age			Professor	10.2	23.9
			Assoc. Prof.	...	27.6
25 - 29	12.2	3.0	Ass't. Prof.	12.2	26.1
30 - 39	49.1	39.6	Instructor	12.2	4.5
40 - 49	20.4	29.9	Other	12.2	9.0
50 - 59	16.3	26.1	No Rank	53.2	9.0
60 and over	2.0	1.4			
Ethnic Background			**Highest Degree**		
Black	2.1	8.3	Doctorate	40.8	64.9
Caucasian	97.9	72.8	Masters	55.1	24.7
Native American		7.6	Bachelors	4.1	6.0
Oriental		2.3	Other Prof.	...	3.7
Spanish Surname		4.5	Assoc. Degree	...	.7
Other		4.5	No Degree	...	...
Sex			**Length of Service**		
Female	56.3	31.1	2 years or less	26.5	5.2
Male	43.7	68.9	3 to 5 years	32.7	24.6
			6 to 8 years	22.4	26.1
			9 or more years	18.4	44.1

[a]Antioch West, Loretto Heights, Stephens

[b]Chicago State, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Northeastern

It should be noted that several differences exist between the two groups of responses. For example, 97.9 percent of the faculty/staff personnel in the private institution's UWW programs were Caucasian while only 72.8 percent of the public institution's UWW personnel were Caucasian. In addition, 40.8 percent of the private institution's respondents had doctorates while 64.9 percent of the public institution's UWW respondents had that degree. Academic rank of the professional staff was also markedly different. The higher proportion of unranked staff in the private institutions was the result of the independent status of the UWW programs in those institutions. UWW staff personnel are hired for service to the UWW program, but they are not selected by academic departments, hence academic rank is usually not available. Another difference was the length of service represented by each group: 40.8 percent of the faculty or staff members involved with UWW in private institutions had been at the institution at least six years. However, 70.2 percent of the public institution's UWW faculty/staff personnel had been at the institution for at least six years. Moreover, the differences in tenure percentages between the two groups do not account for such a great difference in length of service.

Most demographic characteristics of students in each group of institutions, however, were strikingly similar. However, as shown in Table 9, sexual and racial distributions were markedly different.

TABLE 9

UWW STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC COMPARISON: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
(Percent)

Category	Private[a] (n=277)	Public[b] (n=207)
Age		
Under 18	...	.5%
18 - 22	4.0%	5.1
23 - 29	13.7	24.4
30 - 39	35.8	30.4
40 - 49	26.7	21.2
50 - 59	18.4	17.0
60 and over	1.4	1.4
Sex		
Female	87.3	63.8
Male	12.7	37.2
Ethnic Background		
Black	4.6	18.9
Caucasian	79.6	65.9
Native American	7.7	10.1
Oriental	...	.5
Spanish Surname	6.3	3.2
Other	1.8	1.4
Employment		
Full-time	65.5	65.4
Part-time	14.9	21.7
Homemaker	11.3	2.3
Unemployed, seeking	3.6	5.5
Unemployed, not seeking	4.7	5.1

[a]Antioch West, Loretto Heights, Stephens

[b]Chicago State, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Northeastern

The noticeable difference in racial and sexual distribution in Table 9 was the result of the largely female, mostly Caucasian student populations of both Stephens College and Loretto Heights. Approximately eighty-five percent of Stephen's UWW program was composed of registered nurses,and more than ninety percent of the program was female (198 of 224 students). Loretto Heights' female population was about 86 percent. Both Stephens and Loretto Heights serve predominately Caucasian students--217 of 266 combined, or about 82 percent.

Age distribution and full-time employment figures were almost the same. The percentage of students in private and public institutions between the ages of 23 and 49 was 76.2 and 76 percent respectively. In addition, 65.5 percent of the students in UWW programs at private institutions were employed full-time, and 65.4 percent of the students at public institutions were full-time employees.

Academic Degree Delivery Systems

Essentially two different methods of securing baccalaureate degrees possible in University Without Walls programs were examined--credit-hour model or competency model. Either method represented an academic delivery system with unique features. For example, competency-based programs were quite flexible programmatically, but academic progress was difficult to assess. Credit-based programs on the other hand were frequently assessed in number of hours needed to satisfy specific requirements (e.g., to graduate), although often restrictive due to requirements in specific departments or disciplines. Table 10 presents the faculty/staff data aggregated by both delivery systems.

TABLE 10

SELECTED UWW FACULTY/STAFF DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS BY ACADEMIC DELIVERY SYSTEM
(Percent)

Category	Competency-based (n=98)[a]	Credit-Based (n=86)[b]	Category	Competency-based (n=98)[a]	Credit-based (n=86)[b]
Responsibility			**Tenure**		
Teaching	60.2%	67.0%	Yes	56.8%	56.4%
UWW Staff	15.3	30.6	No	43.2	43.6
Other	24.5	2.4			
			Academic Rank		
Age			Professor	21.4	18.8
25 - 29	4.1	7.1	Assoc. Prof.	22.4	17.6
30 - 39	45.9	37.6	Ass't. Prof.	26.6	17.6
40 - 49	27.6	27.1	Instructor	4.1	9.4
50 - 59	20.4	27.1	Other	12.3	7.1
60 and over	2.0	1.1	No Rank	13.2	29.5
Ethnic Background			**Highest Degree**		
Black	6.3	7.1	Doctorate	58.2	58.8
Caucasian	77.1	82.1	Masters	31.6	34.1
Native American	6.3	4.8	Bachelors	6.1	4.7
Oriental	1.0	1.2	Other Prof	3.1	2.4
Spanish Surname	2.0	2.4	Assoc. Degree	1.0	...
Other	7.3	2.4	No Degree	...	...
Sex			**Length of Service**		
Female	36.5	39.3	2 years or less	9.2	12.9
Male	63.5	60.7	3 to 5 years	26.5	27.1
			6 to 8 years	24.5	25.9
			9 or more years	39.8	34.1

[a]Antioch West, Minnesota, Northeastern

[b]Chicago State, Loretto Heights, Massachusetts, Stephens

These data show remarkably similar demographic characteristics: indeed, only academic rank reflects any noticeable difference between the faculty and staff participants--70.4 percent of the faculty/staff members in the competency-based programs have academic ranks of assistant professor or higher while 54 percent of their professional counterparts hold those ranks in the credit-based programs.

As was true in the comparison of faculty/staff in public and private institutions, there are few demographic differences in the students irrespective of which delivery system their institution utilizes. The complete data are incorporated into Table 11.

TABLE 11

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS BY
ACADEMIC DEGREE DELIVERY SYSTEM
(Percent)

Category	Competency-based (n=146)[a]	Credit-based (n=344)[b]
Age		
Under 18	.7%	...
18 - 22	5.4	9.0%
23 - 29	27.7	21.3
30 - 39	33.2	25.5
40 - 49	15.5	24.6
50 - 59	15.5	18.0
60 and over	2.0	1.6
Sex		
Female	56.9	83.7
Male	43.1	16.3
Ethnic Background		
Black	15.5	18.2
Caucasian	68.9	64.5
Native American	10.1	6.6
Oriental	.7	...
Spanish Surname	4.1	6.6
Other	.7	4.1
Employment		
Full-time	64.2	56.5
Part-time	18.2	27.9
Homemaker	2.0	5.7
Unemployed, seeking	6.8	6.6
Unemployed, not seeking	8.8	3.3

[a]Antioch West, Minnesota, Northeastern

[b]Chicago State, Loretto Heights, Massachusetts, Stephens

The difference in student sex distribution was again caused by Loretto Heights and Stephens being part of the same group. Almost three out of four Chicago State UWW students were female as well. Complete sex distribution can be found in Table 3.

Staffing Pattern for Selected UWW Programs

Two basic staffing patterns have evolved to serve students in UWW programs--core staff and decentralized staff. In the core staff pattern primary service to UWW students--advising and counseling--is provided by a full-time staff member of the UWW programs, called a core staff person. This person works with many students as both an academic advisor and program facilitator. Academic advising deals with documenting past learning, developing a degree plan (the student's individual curriculum), and planning for the completion of the degree program. Core staff people usually have no additional responsibility at the host institution,and their singular role is to serve the students in the UWW program.

The decentralized staffing pattern is highlighted by a small administrative UWW staff which handles procedural and recordkeeping matters, but which does not programmatically advise students. This important academic task is performed by full-time faculty members at the institution,and such advisement is normally an additional responsibility, beyond the expected teaching, research and service responsibilities of the faculty member. Most frequently, UWW advisement is the responsibility of a large number of faculty advisors, each of whom

works with from one to four UWW students. Illustrative of this point, 68.4 percent of the faculty/staff respondents from the institutions using decentralized academic advisement reported that their UWW advisement took ten percent or less of their professional time.

Table 12 provides the complete data of demographic characteristics comparing the two different staffing patterns. Not surprisingly, more than one-third of the respondents of the core staff model were UWW staff personnel, while more than 72 percent of the decentralized staff personnel were teaching faculty members. The differences in tenure proportions can also be explained by the staffing and advisement pattern utilized by the institution. Length of service was also different, probably due to the potentially temporal nature of UWW staff appointments. On the other hand, teaching faculty appointments tend to be more permanent in nature, especially with 65.5 percent of the decentralized staffing model respondents having tenure.

TABLE 12

SELECTED UWW FACULTY/STAFF CHARACTERISTICS: CORE STAFF AND DECENTRALIZED ADVISEMENT
(Percent)

Category	Core[a] (n=73)	Decentralized[b] (n=111)	Category	Core[a] (n=73)	Decentralized[b] (n=111)
Responsibility			**Tenure**		
Teaching	50.0%	72.1%	Yes	38.7%	66.4%
UWW Staff	34.7	13.5	No	61.3	33.6
Other	15.3	14.4			
			Academic Rank		
Age			Professor	18.1	21.6
25 - 29	8.3	3.6	Assoc. Prof.	9.7	27.1
30 - 39	45.9	39.7	Ass't. Prof.	27.8	18.9
40 - 49	23.6	29.7	Instructor	11.0	3.6
50 - 59	20.8	25.2	Other	15.3	6.3
60 and over	1.4	1.8	No Rank	18.1	22.5
Ethnic Background			**Highest Degree**		
Black	4.3	8.2	Doctorate	48.6	64.9
Caucasian	82.3	77.4	Masters	41.7	27.0
Native American	4.3	6.2	Bachelors	8.3	3.6
Oriental	1.3	.9	Other Prof.	1.4	3.6
Spanish Surname	2.9	1.8	Assoc. Degree	...	.9
Other	4.3	5.5	No Degree	...	...
Sex			**Length of Service**		
Female	42.9	34.5	2 years or less	19.4	5.4
Male	57.1	65.5	3 to 5 years	34.8	21.6
			6 to 8 years	12.5	33.3
			9 or more years	33.3	39.7

[a]Antioch, Chicago State, Loretto Heights, Minnesota

[b]Massachusetts, Northeastern, Stephens

Because the core staffing pattern requires a relatively large staff, UWW programs using this pattern usually have independent program status; that is, distinct programmatic and budgetary identity. As such they may hire their own staff people to serve specific tasks in the UWW program. However, since these individuals are not hired as part of an academic discipline or department, they frequently are not hired with academic rank. This means that people do not have to have a doctoral degree to be employed in UWW, even though teaching positions at the institution might require a terminal degree as a condition of employment. The information in Table 12 reflects both aspects of this situation as only 27.8 percent of the core staff personnel have rank of associate or full professor while 48.7 percent of the decentralized staff hold those ranks. Further, only 48.6 percent of the core staff have doctorates, although 64.9 percent hold doctorates in the decentralized staffing UWW model. This same difference between the staffing pattern can be seen in the specific professional responsibility each group identifies. Core staff advisors compose 34.7 percent of the total professional staff respondents in the core staff model, while only 13.5 percent of the decentralized advising staff respondents identified themselves as UWW staff.

Again, as was true in the earlier student demographic comparisons, there was little difference when grouping students by staffing pattern employed by the institution for advisement. However, the proportion of younger students (i.e., those 29 and under) in the core staffing pattern

was noticeably higher. This was the outgrowth of two special programs combining UWW with several local community colleges so that comprehensive articulation could be available to students. Also, both Loretto Heights and Minnesota were involved with prison projects which encouraged younger offenders to participate in degree programs through UWW. The sex differences between the two groups was explained in Table 3. Student data are presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
BY STAFFING PATTERN
(Percent)

Category	Core[a] (n=162)	Decentralized[b] (n=328)
Age		
Under 18	.6%	...
18 - 22	8.5	2.4
23 - 29	24.4	15.5
30 - 39	31.2	34.5
40 - 49	19.5	26.7
50 - 59	13.4	20.0
60 and over	2.4	.9
Sex		
Female	69.8	79.9
Male	30.2	20.1
Ethnic Background		
Black	13.8	9.4
Caucasian	68.2	77.3
Native American	7.8	9.4
Oriental	.6	...
Spanish Surname	6.6	3.0
Other	3.0	.9
Employment		
Full-time	57.3	69.6
Part-time	23.2	15.2
Homemaker	4.3	8.8
Unemployed, seeking	7.3	3.0
Unemployed, not seeking	7.9	3.4

[a]Antioch, Chicago State, Loretto, Minnesota

[b]Massachusetts, Northeastern, Stephens

Length of Time Required to Complete a Baccalaureate Degree

The length of time required to complete a baccalaureate degree is usually viewed as four years. Financial aid standards, academic scholarships, talent awards, and numerous other support programs are usually available for four years in recognition of this time factor. However, the time required to complete an undergraduate degree is under review. In one of its more sweeping statements, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education declared that a substantial reduction of time was possible,and even critics of time-shortening approaches agree with the concept of speeding up the time spent in undergraduate education. Spurrs, for example, states, "Degree structures should be flexible in time required for the completion of the academic program in order to encourage acceleration."[11]

Both the student and faculty/staff respondents shared similar views on the length of time necessary to earn a baccalaureate degree in UWW. Table 14 presents the data. It is interesting that fifteen percent more faculty/staff respondents than student respondents believed that the UWW program required less time to complete than a traditional undergraduate degree program. Students would have been more likely to view UWW as a time-shortening academic vehicle. There was close agreement on the actual time expected to be devoted to earning a degree in UWW. As

---

[11] Stephen H. Spurrs, Academic Degree Structure: Innovative Approaches, Principles of Reform in Degree Structures in the United States (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), p.26.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF EXPECTED LENGTH OF TIME TO GRADUATE IN UWW

(Percent)

Classification	Students (n=484)	Faculty/Staff (n=182)
Actual Length		
Less than 1 year	9.1%	3.3%
Between 1 and 2 years	48.4	54.1
Between 2 and 3 years	27.9	36.9
More than 3 years	13.8	5.7
Comparative Length		
Less time	38.5	53.8
About the same time	25.5	17.9
More time	15.6	10.9
No basis for judgment	19.4	16.8

many as 57.5 percent of the students responded that they expected to complete their degree in two years or less, while 57.4 percent of the faculty and staff identified the same period of time for the completion of a degree.

It must be pointed out, however, that the time-shortening feature of UWW has another aspect. While the role of flexible programming and individual advisement contribute to speeding up a UWW student's graduation, the previous formal college education of an individual was also important. Formal credit in higher education is the standard coin of the academic realm, and, if a student already has three or more years of formal coursework, the UWW program may not be doing anything more than merely concluding an academic program which began earlier.

In order to minimize the confusion of semester-or quarter-hour

credits, and to account for the flexible use of credit recognition in competency-based UWW programs, formal college credit in the present study was noted in years of credit transferred to the host institution. This data, identified by the students, is summarized in Table 15.

TABLE 15

PREVIOUS FORMAL COLLEGE CREDIT
EARNED BY UWW STUDENTS
(Percent)

No previous credit	12.1%
About one year	20.9
About two years	28.5
About three years	25.1
More than three years	13.8

(n=484)

There was close agreement between these data and the information summarized in Table 14. For example, 12.1 percent of the student respondents indicated transfer of less than one year of formal college credit while 13.8 percent of the students expected to take more than three years to graduate in UWW. In addition, 12.6 percent of the students indicated transfer of more than three years of college credit while 9.1 percent of the students expected to graduate in less than one year. While the investigator made no attempt to compare each individual response to verify the direct relationship of the responses, the proportions appear strikingly similar.

In addition, 148 of the 484 UWW student respondents (30.6 percent) indicated the number of credits accepted by the host institution. While the range of these credit hours was from 3 to 105 semester hours,

the average was 45 hours, or about a year and a half of formal college work. These data also are consistent with both Table 17 and Table 18, although the data came from different portions of the questionnaire.

Comparative Academic Quality

The issue of academic quality is difficult to address. Non-traditional or alternative educational endeavors are often viewed with skepticism and suspicion because they differ from the accepted practices in higher education. A 1971 survey of 259 graduate deans, for example, found that "most graduate deans have negative feelings about non-traditional" educational efforts.[12] Yet Cross argues that current practices in higher education may not be equally effective for all people. "The impetus for change in the remaining years of this century will come from a recognition that higher education does not offer all of its constituencies equally good learning experiences."[13]

In an attempt to assess faculty and staff views of the academic quality of their UWW programs, several different questions addressing that issue were incorporated into the survey instrument. Table 16 presents the results of that information.

---

[12]James R. Schoemer, James E. Thomas and Wendell H. Bragonier, "A Study of the Effect of Non-traditional Grades on Admission to Graduate School and the Awarding of Financial Assistance," College and University 48 (Spring 1973): 153.

[13]K. Patricia Cross, "The Instructional Revolution," in Individualizing the System, ed. Dyckman W. Vermilye (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 51.

TABLE 16

FACULTY/STAFF OPINION
OF ACADEMIC QUALITY
(Percent)

Issue	Faculty/Staff Opinion
Academic Quality	(n=180)
Higher quality in UWW	26.7%
About the same quality	46.6
Lower quality in UWW	13.9
No basis for judgment	12.8
Quality of UWW Graduates	(n=181)
Better prepared than others	47.5
About the same preparation	26.0
Not as well prepared	12.1
No opinion	14.4

The people involved with UWW generally have a positive feeling for the academic quality of the program. For example, almost half of the professional respondents felt that UWW graduates were better prepared than graduates in traditional undergraduate programs at their institution. This view may be self-serving since these people work closely with the UWW students and thus might feel required to have a high opinion of their own professional efforts. It may also be that these individuals have a low regard for graduates from their own institutions in more traditional programs. Nonetheless, it was worth noting the high proportion of respondents who indicated that UWW was at least as sound academically as traditional baccalaureate programs at their institutions.

In both sets of data in Table 16 there was a marked difference between higher and lower quality in UWW as identified by the faculty/staff respondents. Specifically, almost twice as many respondents indicated the academic quality in UWW was higher than the respondents who judged UWW as being lower in quality. The assessment of graduate quality was even more one-sided. Almost four times the number of faculty/staff respondents judged UWW students as being better prepared than the respondents who indicated UWW graduates were not as well prepared.

However, in the opinion of the UWW faculty and staff respondents, their professional colleagues did not share their high regard for UWW. Table 17 provides the data for that comparison. Although 71.8 percent of

TABLE 17

UWW QUALITY VIEWED BY
NON-INVOLVED PROFESSIONALS
(Percent)

Opinion of UWW	Colleagues View (n=182)
Better than other programs	11.5%
About the same	20.9
Not as good as other programs	39.6
No basis for judgment	28.0

the faculty/staff respondents viewed the academic quality of UWW as the same or higher than traditional undergraduate programs, only 32.4 percent of their professional colleagues not involved with UWW shared that view. Indeed, more than three times as many colleagues not associated with the program were viewed as regarding UWW as being not as good as traditional

programs as opposed to those who regarded UWW as better.

Not surprisingly, students had a somewhat higher regard for the UWW program's quality than did the faculty and staff. These data are presented in Table 18. Almost 42 percent of the student respondents

TABLE 18

STUDENT OPINION OF ACADEMIC QUALITY IN UWW
(Percent)

UWW Academic Quality	Student View (n=493)
Higher quality	42.1%
About the same	38.3
Lower quality	2.8
No basis for judgment	16.8

indicated that the academic quality of UWW was higher than the traditional program's quality. Only 2.8 percent believed that UWW was of lower quality. However, the proportion of UWW students who felt that the quality of their programs was at least as good as the quality in traditional programs at the institution was not widely different from the faculty/staff view--students, 80.4 percent (Table 18); faculty/staff, 73.3 percent (Table 16).

Participation in UWW

The involvement of professional people outside the usual collegiate setting was one of the goals of the UWW program when it was established. A major UECU "organizing concept" for UWW was that "many persons outside the regular educational institution can contribute

significantly to students' undergraduate experience."[14] Since all of the UWW programs surveyed (except Stephens) use off-campus experts as resource people and advisors, faculty and staff respondents were asked to judge the contribution of off-campus, non-collegiate personnel involved with UWW. Excluding the Stephens' responses, the results of that question are presented in Table 19.

TABLE 19

FACULTY/STAFF OPINION OF INVOLVEMENT
OF OFF-CAMPUS, NON-COLLEGIATE PERSONNEL
(Percent)

Role of Off-Campus People	(n=156)
Enhances the quality	63.5%
Does not affect it in either direction	14.7
Detracts from the quality	5.1
No opinion	16.7

The proportion of respondents indicating that off-campus people enhanced the quality of UWW was surprisingly high--more than 60 percent felt these personnel improved the program. This was especially true when coupled with the fact that 59.8 percent of the faculty/staff respondents had academic ranks of associate or full professor (see Table 7). Seemingly, these professional respondents were acknowledging noticeable contributions from non-collegiate personnel outside the normally accepted academic criteria--campus-based instruction with professionally trained personnel.

---

[14] First Report, p. 30.

Not too much should be made of this point, however, because UWW students usually try to combine formal education with practical experience. The off-campus personnel were frequently associated with UWW students in an employment setting. Table 20 presents the information on UWW student employment.

TABLE 20

UWW STUDENT EMPLOYMENT AND RELATIONSHIP TO DEGREE PROGRAM
(Percent)

Employment	Student Response (n=492)
Employment Status	
Full-time	65.4%
Part-time	17.9
Homemaker	7.3
Unemployed, seeking	4.5
Unemployed, not seeking	4.9
Relationship to UWW	
Directly related	41.1
Somewhat related	30.3
Unrelated	16.1
Not applicable	12.6

More than seven of every ten UWW student respondents indicated that their employment was related to their academic degree program. Conversely, only 16.1 percent of these same student respondents identified their job as being unrelated to their UWW degree program. The proportion of respondents indicating that their employment was either unrelated or not applicable to their educational program (28.7 percent)

can be explained by the homemaker or unemployed status identified by 16.7 percent of the same student respondents. In other words, there appears to be consistency between the proportion of UWW student respondents indicating current employment and the proportion of student identifying their jobs as being related to their UWW program.

Summary

There were specific differences--both demographic and programmatic--which were presented in the preceding tables. In the aggregate, there were more similarities than differences in both student and faculty/staff data. For example, there was little difference between faculty and staff groups when age, ethnic background, academic rank, and highest degree were considered (Tables 6, 7, 8, 10, and 12). There was also considerable agreement regarding academic quality in UWW among faculty and staff (Table 16). Involvement of off-campus personnel (Table 19), length of time to complete a degree program in UWW (Table 14), and the view of non-involved professional colleagues (Table 17) all show a consistent agreement among the faculty and staff respondents. The issues on which most of the inconsistencies were found tended to be programmatically related. For example, academic rank and highest degree data were different when public and private institutions were compared (Table 8) and when advisement patterns were compared (Table 12). Nonetheless, the aggregate analysis indicated that there was strong agreement on most matters connected with UWW in the seven programs examined as judged by faculty/staff respondents.

Student respondents also reflected a high level of agreement on matters related to UWW. As with the faculty/staff group, the student data showed consistency in the aggregate. There were some differences in age, sex, and ethnic background which were noticeable in institutional comparisons (Tables 3, 4, and 5). However, on such matters as length of time to graduate in UWW (Table 14), overall academic quality (Table 18), and the role of employment in the UWW program (Table 20), there was little difference in the information from students when considered collectively.

In sum, there was consistency in the UWW data, from both student and faculty/staff respondents. It should be noted, however, that each UWW program in the present study had a least one common feature--it offered its own institution's degree. Also, at each institution, UWW represents only a small portion of the total academic program,and usually UWW needed to conform to institutional criteria and academic standards. Thus, the already existing set of institutional degree expectations would seem to force UWW programs into some kind of institutional conformity.

CHAPTER III

INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

The demographic and programmatic data secured through the survey of the seven University Without Walls programs was reported in Chapter II. The data from the two opinion sections of the survey instrument were used to provide a basis for an analysis of each program. The opinion portions of each questionnaire were divided into two general categories--"actual" UWW program and an "ideal" UWW-type program.

The actual portion asked each respondent to judge the present UWW program in terms of personal experience by indicating an opinion on thirty-seven specific statements. In the ideal section, each respondent was asked to give opinions regarding an ideal UWW-type program using twenty-five statements as the basis for their responses. Twenty-four of the statements in each section were identical, thus allowing for a comparison of responses.

Aggregate Analysis

Because each of the seven University Without Walls programs was a unique academic undertcking, the investigator needed to determine whether or not students and faculty/staff groups at each institution shared common views of the UWW programs. Therefore, it was necessary to determine whether or not the student and faculty/staff responses at each

institution were equally distributed for each set of paired responses. To see if there was uniformity throughout the seven institutions on specific issues in UWW, the aggregated data from all student and faculty/staff respondents at each institution were compared. For example, Y1 stated, "Development of the degree plan is the primary responsibility of the student." Z1 was the same statement except it was restated in the "ideal" section as "Development of a degree plan in a UWW-type program should be the primary responsibility of the student."

Using this comparative technique, only four opinion items in the questionnaire were identified as being commonly viewed by both student and faculty/staff respondents. Table 21 presents the data.

TABLE 21

AGGREGATE FACULTY/STAFF AND STUDENT
OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Acquiring an education in a specific field is most important feature in UWW (Y20 - Z11)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	14	29	30	74	19	15	181
Ideal	12	39	42	77	9	2	181
Students							
Real	45	134	73	191	26	21	490
Ideal	57	119	133	156	16	7	488
Minimal enrollment or residency requirements are strength of this program (Y26 - Z18)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	21	67	25	24	3	42	182
Ideal	81	92	8	0	0	0	181
Students							
Real	69	181	80	49	8	103	490
Ideal	220	252	10	2	1	2	487
Different admission standards are used for UWW students (Y28 -Z17)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	30	84	12	12	3	42	183
Ideal	48	85	16	20	9	3	181
Students							
Real	56	188	41	43	12	151	491
Ideal	96	221	56	78	27	8	486

TABLE 21

(Continued)

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Qualifications for faculty members are the same in UWW and in more traditional programs (Y30 - Z19)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	34	75	9	35	5	23	181
Ideal	50	64	14	41	10	2	181
Students							
Real	94	169	27	38	12	151	491
Ideal	139	201	39	74	22	12	487

These data show, for example, that 48.4 percent of the faculty/staff respondents and 51 percent of the student respondents either agreed or agreed strongly on current practices regarding minimal enrollment. Further, in an ideal UWW-type program, 95.6 percent of the faculty/staff and 96.9 percent of the students indicated the same degree of agreement regarding minimal enrollment or residency being a strength. The remaining three issues show similar levels of agreement. It was concluded, therefore, that there were few programmatic or academic features of the University Without Walls programs which were common in each of the seven programs examined. This was the author's initial hypothesis and an important consideration

for employing an analysis of individual institutions.

Three of the four statements agreed upon by both student and faculty/staff people were procedural; one was programmatic:

1) Acquiring an education in a specific field is (should be) the most important feature of a UWW program. [Programmatic]

2) Minimum enrollment or residency requirements are (should be) a strength in the UWW program.

3) Different admission standards are (should be) used for UWW students than are (should be) used for students in traditional degree programs at this institution.

4) Qualifications for faculty members working in UWW are (should be) the same as the qualifications for regular faculty members in more traditional programs at this institution.

Given the nature of the demographic profile of the UWW students, it was not surprising that education in a specific field was viewed as an important feature of UWW by both the students and faculty/staff personnel. Education in a specific field or area, often desirable because of a student's employment, was shown as a key factor in a student's choice of UWW. The remaining three statements merely acknowledge institutional practices regarding UWW.

Institutional Analysis

Since each UWW program was examined individually, it was necessary to review data for each program separately. In order to determine whether or not the students and faculty/staff members shared common views about UWW, their opinion responses were analyzed. As explained in Chapter II there were several different programmatic approaches used in UWW--delivery systems, credit hours, and staffing patterns. However, each program was internally consistent so while there were differences between

programs, there would be few programmatic differences within a single program. Therefore, it was assumed that faculty/staff and student respondents would have similar bases for comparison even though their opinions might differ on isolated single issues or topics.

Antioch College/West

Because of the small response at Antioch West, it was not clear whether or not there were differences between student perceptions and faculty/staff views. Since the data represented a very small sample, the results should be viewed as inconclusive at best.

Chicago State University

The faculty and staff at Chicago State University concluded that the UWW program's actual operation and the ideal expectation for the program were congruous. In their view, in other words, there was close agreement between both the real and ideal opinions of UWW. Although the total number of faculty/staff respondents was small, it does represent responses from more than one-third of the professional people involved with UWW at Chicago State. However, the author considered the data sufficient to conclude that the faculty/staff group was not necessarily satisfied or dissatisfied with the present program.

The students, however, did not agree on four issues as reflected in the composite data in Table 22. In each case the students felt that the present UWW program did not achieve what they felt it should in these areas. However, it must be noted that only one of these concerns (Y27-Z16) was related to academic or programmatic issues. The remainder were related to procedural program matters.

TABLE 22

CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENT
OPINIONS OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Student involvement in hiring (Y9 - Z6)							
Real	1	3	5	11	8	1	28
Ideal	2	11	6	9	0	1	29
Reduced tuition and fees in UWW (Y14 - Z7)							
Real	1	2	1	14	7	4	29
Ideal	7	8	5	7	0	2	29
Advising process helpful in UWW (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	5	19	1	2	1	0	28
Ideal	14	15	0	0	0	0	29
Clearly defined academic controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Real	2	12	4	4	4	4	29
Ideal	5	22	1	1	0	0	29

The discrepancy between the student opinion of the real and ideal UWW program can be easily seen. For example, on the issue of clearly defined academic controls, 48.3 percent of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. However, 93.1 percent of the same

respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement on the issue from the perspective of an ideal UWW-type program.

Two issues identified by the students at Chicago State were predictable. Student participation in professional staff selection is usually not the practice at the institution. Choice of academic personnel is usually left to department or discipline members who have credentials to select their peers. Therefore, it was not surprising that student involvement in hiring was viewed differently in an ideal setting. Because Chicago State is a public institution, tuition and fee structure for all students is set by institutional policy. As a consequence, it is extremely difficult to establish a differentiated tuition or fee rate for a special program. Since UWW is a credit-based program leading to a baccalaureate degree, tuition and fees are fixed throughout the university. Thus, irrespective of the UWW student opinion, it is doubtful if the current tuition policy can be changed.

Loretto Heights College

In three cases the faculty and staff at Loretto Heights were dissatisfied with the present UWW program--two issues were programmatic, one procedural. Table 23 presents the data.

TABLE 23

LORETTO HEIGHTS COLLEGE FACULTY/STAFF
OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Selection of new students is responsibility of UWW staff (Y3 - Z3)							
Real	0	2	1	6	5	0	14
Ideal	5	7	1	1	0	0	14
UWW students learn about a wide variety of subjects (Y15 - Z8)							
Real	1	6	1	5	1	0	14
Ideal	4	7	3	0	0	0	14
There are clearly defined academic quality controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Real	2	3	3	5	1	0	14
Ideal	5	9	0	0	0	0	14

Since 13 of the 14 professional respondents at Loretto Heights College were UWW staff personnel, their opinions on student selection (Y3 - Z3) were not surprising. The practice in the program was to have a committee of staff people interview potential students prior to admission. As indicated in the data, however, that practice was not being followed. The issue of academic quality controls was a problem for Loretto Heights

respondents as it had been at Antioch. Apparently in an attempt to provide programmatic flexibility in UWW, there was a feeling that appropriate academic controls were not being exercised.

Unfortunately, fourteen respondents do not represent an appropriate sample of the Loretto Heights College UWW faculty and staff. These general conclusions, therefore, must be considered tentative.

Loretto Heights' students as in the case of Chicago State's students, identified three of the four issues which were procedural rather than programmatic. However, in the last three items in Table 24 the students showed concern about present practices being more undesirable than those in an ideal UWW-type program. For example, the students felt that standardized tests (e.g., GRE, CLEP) were currently used more widely than they felt they should be. Similarly, the students felt that the present UWW program was more interdisciplinary than desirable in an ideal analog. Complete information on these student identified issues is presented in Table 24.

TABLE 24

LORETTO HEIGHTS COLLEGE STUDENT OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Reduced tuition and fees in UWW (Y14 - Z7)							
Real	2	3	3	15	13	6	42
Ideal	13	10	9	6	0	3	41
Faculty committee assessment of prior learning (Y2 - Z12)							
Real	9	26	2	2	1	2	42
Ideal	3	18	5	9	5	1	41
Interdisciplinary rather than one field (Y32 - Z21)							
Real	11	27	3	0	0	1	42
Ideal	8	21	7	4	1	0	41
Use of standardized tests (Y36 - Z24)							
Real		8	7	9	3	15	42
Ideal		6	9	7	12	7	41

The issue of faculty committee assessment of prior learning was noticeably disparate. As seen in Table 23, 14 of 41 faculty/staff respondents (36.6 percent) disagreed to some extend that a committee should evaluate prior learning. Only 3 of 42 student respondents (7.1 percent) indicated that the practice was part of the present UWW program at Loretto Heights. Apparently the

UWW students felt that the UWW staff should assess earlier learning which was not the typical practice at most institutions. Willingham, for example, identified institutional acceptance of prior learning when he noted, "the important point is that assessment should have the effect of emphasizing what the institution wants to emphasize."[1] It would be difficult to believe that a UWW staff would be more representative of an institution than its traditional academic staff.

University of Massachusetts

Only two issues were singled out by the Massachusetts faculty and staff members involved with UWW. The students were also concerned about these same issues,and each group was concerned that the present program was falling short of the ideal level for academic control. The specific data are displayed in Table 25.

---

[1]Warren W. Willingham, "Critical Issues and Basic Requirements for Assessment," in Morris Keaton and Associates, Experiential Learning (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 230.

TABLE 25

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS FACULTY/STAFF AND STUDENT OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Clearly defined academic quality controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	3	11	5	8	2	5	34
Ideal	18	13	1	0	0	1	33
Students							
Real	2	17	13	12	2	4	50
Ideal	8	35	2	2	1	1	49
Clearly defined method for dete mining graduation (Y37 - Z23)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	3	18	3	4	2	3	33
Ideal	20	12	1	0	0	0	33
Students							
Real	3	33	3	5	1	5	50
Ideal	19	28	1	1	0	1	50

It is evident in both issues that there is a discrepancy between present practice (real) and an ideal UWW-type program. For example, 41.1 percent of the faculty and staff feel that the present UWW program has clearly defined academic quality controls; however, 93.9 percent of these same respondents believe that such controls should exist. Student responses show a similar pattern--38 percent and 87.9 percent respectively--on the

same issue.

The data clearly show that these two issues were central to the UWW program at Massachusetts. It was apparently the ambiguity of the UWW process which concerned the faculty/staff members most. For example, the bulk of the Massachusetts respondents were teaching faculty members (28 of 34, or 82.4 percent). In addition, 85.3 percent were involved with the UWW program for three or more years. The opinions of these respondents, therefore, must be considered realistic given the knowledge of UWW they should have had.

The faculty/staff concerns, however, were not considered as necessarily meaning general dissatisfaction with the UWW program. Table 26 presents additional data from the survey instrument.

TABLE 26

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS FACULTY/STAFF
OPINION OF ACADEMIC QUALITY IN UWW

Classification	Faculty/Staff (n=34)
UWW Compared with Traditional Programs	
Higher quality in UWW	23.5%
About the same	44.1
Lower quality in UWW	20.6
No basis for judgment	8.8
UWW Graduates Compared with Traditional Graduates	
UWW better prepared	38.2
About the same	35.3
UWW not as well prepared	17.6
No opinion	5.9

It should be noted also that only two of the twenty-four issues in UWW were not consistent as seen in the comparison of real and ideal opinions of the Massachusetts faculty and staff.

In addition to the academic quality-control concerns shared with the faculty and staff respondents, the students found discrepancy in four procedural areas within their UWW program. These data are shown in Table 27.

TABLE 27

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS STUDENT
OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Student admission is responsibility of UWW staff (Y3 - Z3)							
Real	2	7	10	16	7	8	50
Ideal	15	20	9	4	1	0	49
Student involvement in hiring (Y9 - Z6)							
Real	5	12	3	11	5	14	50
Ideal	14	16	7	9	1	2	49
Reduced tuition and fees in UWW (Y14 -Z7)							
Real	1	20	4	14	8	3	50
Ideal	13	21	6	6	1	2	49
Advising process helpful (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	2	34	8	2	3	1	50
Ideal	16	33	0	0	0	0	49

In each case the students felt that the present UWW program did not conform to their view of an ideal UWW-type program. The most striking disparity was in student admission, where the students believed the UWW staff should become more involved in the selection process. Comparing the results of the data on this issue, 18 percent of the students believed that the selection of new students was being done by the UWW staff while 71.4 percent believed selection should be done by this group. In addition, 72 percent believed that the advising process was currently helpful, while 100 percent thought such advising should be helpful.

University of Minnesota

The only joint concern shared by both students and faculty/staff members at Minnesota was the matter of clearly defined graduation requirements. Two additional issues were identified by the faculty and staff, and Table 28 summarizes the concerns of the Minnesota professional respondents.

TABLE 28

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA FACULTY/STAFF
OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Wide variety of subject areas, not concentration (Y15 - Z8)							
Real	0	8	3	15	4	9	39
Ideal	10	13	11	5	0	0	39

TABLE 28

(Continued)

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Clearly defined academic quality controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Real	4	10	7	9	2	6	38
Ideal	23	14	1	0	0	1	39
Academic accountability and quality controls, same for UWW and traditional (Y35 - Z20)							
Real	2	8	2	16	5	6	39
Ideal	8	16	5	7	2	1	39

Only 20.5 percent of the respondents felt that the present UWW program offered a wide variety of subject choices. Conversely, 59 percent felt in an ideal UWW-type program a wide variety of subject areas should be available. In a similar manner, 25.6 percent of the faculty and staff felt that the same accountability and quality controls should apply to both UWW and more traditional programs. However, more than twice that number (61.5 percent) believed that the same criteria should be used in an ideal UWW-type setting.

Student opinion at Minnesota was similar to opinion of other UWW students in that the concerns centered on procedural rather than academic

matters. Table 29 presents the data on four issues with which the students indicated disagreement.

TABLE 29

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA STUDENT OPINION
OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Student admission is responsibility of UWW staff (Y3 - Z3)							
Real	4	19	16	17	4	22	82
Ideal	18	34	15	7	3	5	82
Reduced tuition and fees in UWW (Y14 -Z7)							
Real	3	9	5	32	25	8	82
Ideal	23	29	14	12	1	2	81
Student programs in UWW usually not available at institution (Y18 - Z10)							
Real	31	39	5	2	1	4	82
Ideal	10	38	22	11	0	0	81
Advising process helpful (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	19	45	11	3	2	1	81
Ideal	43	37	1	0	0	0	81

The students at Minnesota were the only ones who showed concern about the

academic programs in UWW being unavailable at the institution. Specifically, 89.7 percent indicated that students could now develop academic programs not usually available at the baccalaureate level at Minnesota. However, only 59.3 percent of these same students believed that such a situation should occur in an ideal UWW-type program. No evidence was found to explain this concern. Nonetheless, coupled with the apparent dissatisfaction regarding advisement, it may indicate that too much programmatic flexibility was found to be a difficulty by students when working closely with faculty members on unique curricula. The balance of the student concerns reflected those of students in most other UWW programs.

Northeastern Illinois University

Faculty and staff members at Northeastern indicated a high degree of dissatisfaction between the actual and ideal opinions of the UWW program at the institution. Major concerns identified by this group are summarized in Table 30.

TABLE 30

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY FACULTY/STAFF
OPINIONS OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Wide variety of subject areas, not concentration (Y15 - Z8)							
Real	4	8	5	22	8	3	50
Ideal	14	18	8	10	0	0	50
Advising process helpful (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	14	28	5	2	0	1	50
Ideal	25	25	0	0	0	0	50
Clearly defined academic quality controls (Y27 - Z16)							
Real	6	16	9	10	3	6	50
Ideal	28	21	1	0	0	0	50
Same quality controls in UWW as in more traditional programs (Y35 - Z20)							
Real	3	9	6	23	6	2	49
Ideal	11	21	6	8	2	2	50
Interdisciplinary rather than concentrated (Y32 - Z21)							
Real	11	15	10	9	2	3	50
Ideal	15	23	9	3	0	0	50
Clearly defined graduation requirements (Y37 - Z23)							
Real	9	26	2	7	2	3	49
Ideal	25	23	1	0	1	0	50
Use of standardized tests (Y36 - Z24)							
Real	0	2	4	14	9	20	49
Ideal	4	9	16	8	11	2	50

It appeared that UWW at Northeastern was suspect in quality in the view of the faculty/staff respondents. This apparent suspicion could be the result of UWW being the only non-credit-based degree program at the institution, resulting in difficulty with faculty members understanding the unique features of the competency-based UWW program. However, the degree of difference between the present and ideal UWW-type program seemed to reflect a real concern about academic quality.

One of the most surprising results reflected in Table 30 was the role of standardized tests. Only 4.1 percent of the faculty/staff respondents felt that the present UWW program was using standardized tests while 26 percent believed such tests should be used in an ideal setting. No other institution's data reflected a similar desire for more such testing. However, it should be noted that the desirability of such testing might be as an exit exam, thereby confirming the student's competence in a more traditional manner. Acceptable performance by a UWW student with such instruments would provide concrete evidence of academic achievement, something frequently lacking in competency-based programs.

Given these data, it was somewhat difficult to understand why 72.3 percent of these same respondents identified the academic quality of the UWW program as being the same or higher quality than the more traditional programs at the institution. Further, 71.5 percent of the Northeastern faculty and staff respondents indicated that UWW graduates were as well or better prepared than graduates of more traditional baccalaureate degree programs at the institution. Table 31 presents the data.

TABLE 31

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY FACULTY/STAFF
OPINION OF ACADEMIC QUALITY IN UWW

Issue	Faculty/Staff
UWW Compared with Traditional Programs	(n=47)
Higher quality in UWW	40.4%
About the same quality	31.9
Lower quality in UWW	17.0
No basis for judgment	10.7
UWW Graduates Compared with Traditional Graduates	(n=49)
UWW better prepared	53.1
About the same	18.4
UWW not as well prepared	20.4
No opinion	8.1

For whatever reasons, however, more concerns about UWW were identified by the faculty and staff respondents at Northeastern than at five of the other six programs or institutions.

Student perceptions at Northeastern were quite different from those of the professional staff. Other than the concerns shared with the faculty and staff regarding clearly defined graduation and helpful advising, the students identified only the selection of new students and possible tuition differential as points of disagreement when comparing the present program to the ideal analog. All other features of the UWW program at Northeastern were viewed as compatible by the students.

Stephens College

There was more discrepancy between the present and ideal UWW program at Stephens than at any other institution in the present study. Both the students and the faculty/staff respondents confirmed the disparity of two issues--existence of clearly defined academic quality controls and curricular choice restriction. The data on both topics is presented in Table 32. On each of the issues, the students and faculty/staff members

TABLE 32

STEPHENS COLLEGE FACULTY/STAFF AND STUDENT OPINION OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Clearly defined academic conrols (Y27 - Z16)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	6	9	5	6	1	0	27
Ideal	16	11	0	0	0	0	27
Students							
Real	36	123	20	6	0	29	224
Ideal	78	129	9	4	1	1	222
Curricular choices in UWW greater (Y33 - Z22)							
Faculty/Staff							
Real	0	4	4	15	3	1	27
Ideal	5	9	8	4	1	0	27
Students							
Real	20	50	34	52	7	61	224
Ideal	33	114	53	19	0	3	222

agreed that the present UWW program at Stephens did not reach the desired level of an ideal UWW-type program.

In addition, the faculty and staff respondents from Stephens identified three other areas of concern which are presented in Table 33.

TABLE 33

STEPHENS COLLEGE FACULTY/STAFF OPINIONS OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Wide variety of subject areas, not concentration (Y15 - Z8)							
Real	4	12	4	4	3	0	27
Ideal	12	11	3	1	0	0	27
Academic accountability and control, same for UWW and traditional (Y35 - Z25)							
Real	4	13	1	8	1	0	27
Ideal	9	15	2	1	0	0	27
Academic quality should be similar in UWW and other programs (Y35 - Z20)							
Real	4	13	1	8	1	0	27
Ideal	13	14	0	0	0	0	27

These data show that program quality was the most pronounced matter at Stephens in UWW since all five of the issues identified were directly related to program quality. This may be the result of how the Stephens'

UWW program was structured. It was essentially a course-based degree program where instruction was provided at off-campus sites by regular Stephens' faculty. In other words, existing courses were taken to off-campus sites, but little nontraditionalism was part of the Stephens' UWW program. Therefore, there should have been close agreement between UWW and Stephens' traditional undergraduate program since the two were essentially the same.

The major programmatic difference in UWW at Stephens was that there was a regular residency seminar (three weeks long) which was required of all UWW students. The seminar was held at the main campus at Columbia, Missouri. Portfolio development was undertaken during the seminar, and the basic rules of the UWW program were explained. After that, Stephens' UWW program operated along the lines of a traditional extension program utilizing off-campus teaching sites. Thus the differences identified between the real and ideal UWW-type program were merely the perception that UWW should look more like the conventional Stephens' curriculum. The data in Tables 31 and 32 reflected that view.

Student opinion of the present UWW program and the ideal analog were also divided. Nine of the twenty-four paired variables reflected disparate measures as judged by the students. Two of these issues were already shown in Table 32; the remainder were incorporated into Table 34.

TABLE 34

STEPHENS COLLEGE STUDENT OPINIONS OF SELECTED ISSUES IN UWW

Issue	Number of Responses						
	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable	Total
Student degree plan development (Y1 - Z1)							
Real	21	126	9	59	5	1	221
Ideal	22	95	26	67	12	0	222
Reduced tuition and fees (Y14 - Z14)							
Real	6	20	12	95	41	49	223
Ideal	86	130	4	2	0	0	222
Student planning freedom (Y16 - Z9)							
Real	67	146	5	3	1	1	223
Ideal	54	133	23	9	1	0	220
Increased formal classroom instruction (Y23 - Z13)							
Real	7	25	37	113	39	3	224
Ideal	11	60	50	77	22	2	222
Advising process helpful (Y25 - Z14)							
Real	50	130	20	18	2	4	224
Ideal	86	130	4	2	0	0	222
Interdisciplinary rather than concentrated (Y32 - Z21)							
Real	57	135	17	8	1	5	223
Ideal	47	113	40	17	2	3	222
Clearly defined graduation requirements (Y37 - Z23)							
Real	36	161	9	7	2	8	223
Ideal	73	139	7	1	3	0	223

As shown in Table 33 the disagreement between the present program and its ideal counterpart was evident. Indeed, even the basic tenet of the UWW approach--student responsibility in the development of the degree plan--was questioned. Although 66.5 percent of the student respondents cited student responsibility for the degree plan in the present program, only 52.7 percent believed that the student should plan his/her degree plan in an ideal UWW-type program. This was the only instance in the present study where too much student freedom was identified as a concern in an operating UWW program. Also, more students wanted concentrated fields of study than wanted interdisciplinary experiences in the ideal UWW analog. In all other institutions the desire was for more interdisciplinary exposure.

The student opinion of the UWW program at Stephens was at odds with the majority of student responses at the other institutions. However, this might be attributed to the off-campus nature of the Stephens College UWW program where there was little need for student flexibility because the program was course-based and fairly well prescribed.

Summary

Although the bulk of this chapter was devoted to identifying and explaining specific issues which appeared inconsistent in UWW, it must be noted that the majority of issues examined in the present study were accepted; that is, there was little difference between what the respondents experienced (real) versus what they wanted (ideal). This result should not be lost in the myriad of details presented in this chapter.

It was clear also, moreover, that the similarities within UWW were greater than the differences. In the aggregate there were twenty-four issues examined in the study, only four of which were consistently questioned or at least showed internal inconsistency. The remaining twenty, however, represent a foundation upon which most of the UWW respondents--both faculty/staff and students--agreed. The high level of programmatic agreement can be attributed partly to the commonality of each program--awarding the institutional degree to UWW graduates.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

Personnel in UWW

The quality and preparation of those professional educators involved in UWW were uniformly high, exceeding in the aggregate the preparation, academic rank and tenure proportions of teaching faculty nationwide (Tables 6 and 7). There was also evidence to indicate that UWW was held in high regard at the institutions examined in the present study (Table 16). A plausible explanation for the high proportion of tenured professors involved with UWW might be that they had nothing to lose by becoming involved--their participation was risk-free and, therefore, possible. Another possible explanation was that a disproportionately high number of senior faculty members returned the questionnaire, thus skewing the data. The latter explanation, however, does not seem valid given the consistent demographic information on faculty and staff which emerged from the institutions. Regardless, the credentials of the professional staffs were higher than had been anticipated.

Students in UWW

As a group the students in the UWW programs examined showed more similarity than was anticipated. Demographic information reflected the expected age distributions and employment patterns (Tables 4 and 20 respectively), but the student respondents showed more formal involvement in

education than was expected. For example, 67 percent of the total student respondents indicated that they had had two or more years of formal college credit upon entering UWW (Table 15). Further, more than forty percent of the students indicated that graduation would take two or more years (Table 14). Considered together, these data suggest that UWW was closer than expected to a four-year experience. That outcome was even more unexpected given the time-shortening concept so often associated with nontraditional programs in general, and UWW in particular.

Academic Aspects of UWW

Student opinion identified earlier indicated some concerns among UWW students regarding the academic aspects of their programs. A good example of this feeling was that students at five of the seven institutions surveyed indicated that the present academic quality controls were not as clearly defined as they should be. Students also pointed out that the advising process needed improvement.

Faculty and staff respondents also singled out the academic quality controls and the advising process as essential concerns. In addition, clearly defined graduation requirements was frequently mentioned as a source of concern by these respondents. Not surprisingly, academic matters were of more interest to the faculty and staff than were procedural or administrative concerns.

Summary

Despite identifiable commonalities in both student and faculty/staff responses, the overall picture of UWW which emerged from this study was mixed. Except for the concerns cited above, there were few issues,

topics, or programmatic practices which were uniformly accepted or questioned throughout the seven programs examined. What emerged was a mixed set of reactions and feelings which were seemingly more related to the institution than to UWW. UWW seemed to be more a function of institutional choice with its concomitant strengths and weaknesses than a philosophical commitment to criteria, goals or objectives associated with the program. What is evident from the study was that there was a wide range of reactions to UWW--both positive and negative. There were similarities to be sure, but the conclusion was clear: UWW was a unique academic program available at a number of institutions which shared one basic feature--the name, University Without Walls.

Two of the most frequently identified issues--clearly defined quality controls and clearly defined graduation requirements--are academic matters. In both cases there appeared to be difficulty in establishing overall academic control in several UWW programs. For example, because a learning "team" was involved with a student's program, there were frequent concerns indicating confusion about which person on the team had final (or even primary) academic responsibility. There was confusion in both core staff advisement and decentralized advisement models on this issue as well. The scope of those concerns can be seen in that all the institutions except Antioch identified academic quality controls as a problem area.

Determining eligibility for graduation from a UWW program was also singled out as a problem. There appears to be at least two parts to that issue--the role of experiential learning and the different institutional requirements of other baccalaureate programs. Credit assessment or competence designation of nonclassroom learning remains a difficult matter.

Obviously the manner in which such credit was assessed and how the credit was applied to a UWW program affected the overall degree process. Even at three of the credit-based programs (Loretto Heights, Massachusetts, Stephens), graduation determination was identified as a problem, indicating that assessment of nonclassroom learning was not automatically resolved by assigning specific credits for such learning.

Regardless of what name the final graduation review process had, there was difficulty in awarding the host institution's degree to a graduate in a UWW program. Despite attempts to "mirror" traditional academic degree programs and requirements, UWW remained suspect for its graduation process. An "area of concentration" was considered somewhat analogous to a traditional undergraduate major, and "breadth" was similar to a general education requirement in a more traditional program. The graduation process seemingly was hampered by the ambiguity of the UWW programmatic requirements.

UWW-Related Topics for Study

UWW encompasses many academic features, not all of which are part of the mainstream of contemporary higher education. Quantification of previous nonclassroom learing, for example, was part of UWW, but many other baccalaureate programs did not incorporate this philosophy into more traditional curricula. While the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning (CAEL) has done a great deal of developmental work in this field, there remains need for further study of the implications of certifying previous learning. The disparity of opinion in this study of UWW programs on academic quality issues should be considered additional evidence that the role of experiential learning needs to be clarified. Haberman made the same

point with the questions he raised about credit awards.[1]

In addition, the role of nonclassroom learning and formal recognition or assessment of that learning could have an impact on standardized tests. Stecher, for example, warned about problems of assessment from the standpoint of inflated awards.[2] Further, students whose academic backgrounds contained substantial recognition of experiential learning might skew the results of nationwide standardized examinations.

Although there was no specific attempt to address the assessment issue in this study, it was indicated that the problem existed in UWW. A faculty respondent from the University of Massachusetts wrote, "credit for prior experience weakens the degree--the student already has received "credit" for prior experience in terms of job experience. A degree should show additional strengths."

Utilization of faculty members in one-to-one learning situations should be examined in detail. As the overall enrollments in higher education are projected to decline in the 1980's, more creative use of existing teaching talent will be required. UWW-type curricular arrangements might be a means of meeting changing student needs as well as a method of creatively involving the teaching faculty in flexible, but responsible, academic enterprises. Once a decision on who should do assessment of prior learning

---

[1]Martin Haberman, "New Entry Requirements and New Programs for College Students," in Policy Issues in Education, ed. Allan C. Ornstein and Steven I. Miller (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1976), pp. 95-107.

[2]Carl A. Stecher, "CLEP and the Great Credit Giveaway," Change 9 (March 1977): 36-41.

was made, moreover, a faculty member (or group of faculty members) could be assigned assessment as part of the academic load. If such a model were adopted, assessment could be elevated to a level where it could be part of someone's academic responsibility. Currently, assessment is often done for minor compensation or gratis, depending upon the availability of staff or faculty resources.

Longitudinal studies of UWW graduates should be undertaken to assess the overall impact of these programs. Most present UWW programs have small-scale follow-up studies on their own graduates, but apparently few comprehensive longitudinal studies are currently underway. A recent study of 134 external degree programs and their graduates might serve as a model.[3] Additionally, there were a few suggested topics incorporated in a recent UECU publication.[4]

A comprehensive assessment of faculty attitudes at institutions offering UWW programs would also be useful. This study showed that professional staff people involved directly with UWW generally reacted positively to it, while acknowledging that their non-participating colleagues did not have a high regard for the program. Some studies have been undertaken, but these efforts are too limited at the present time.[5]

---

[3]Carol P. Sosdian and Laure M. Sharp, The External Degree as a Credential: Graduates' Experiences in Employment and Further Study (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978).

[4]Self Study in Progress Reports (Cincinnati, Ohio: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1977).

[5]Jeffrey N. Johnson, "Community Faculty in the University Without Walls at the University of Minnesota: A Preliminary Description," Alternative Higher Education 1 (Fall 1976): 5-13.

There are a myriad of issues in UWW which need more study. Unfortunately, the nature of the programs dictates a costly research design because of the individualization of the academic experience in these programs. Close cooperation amoung UWW directors is also a prerequisite because students seemingly identify with "their" UWW program rather than with a network of similar programs throughout the country. In the present study, for example, the students' addresses were never given to the investigator; rather, the UWW program directors used their mailing lists to distribute the questionnaires. This seemed to be the most practical way to deal with the issue of privacy of student information. Obviously, there are other similar matters which would require working closely with individual UWW programs in any future research. A great deal of money has been made available to support and launch UWW. It is unfortunate that some of these resources have not been directed at comprehensively assessing, examining and analyzing University Without Walls.

A faculty member from Massachusetts (Amherst Campus) wrote:

> The purpose of U.W.W.--as I understand it--is really fine. However, I feel that in many instances an incorrect perspective, re: academic responsibility (student/univeristy) is given or fostered. Students from UWW program do not identify with the degree granting institution. [They] do not see the experience as reciprocal--maybe a result of feeling that one has gotten a degree out of U.W.W., but not an education. I would like to see U.W.W. succeed, however, I think it is time to go back to the drawing board and re-design a more satisfying package.

Perhaps this view is too extreme, but there were enough issues raised about UWW at each institution to warrant a thorough re-examination. So long as the issues related to academic quality remain unresolved, there will be continuing disagreement about University Without Walls.

REFERENCES

Adams, Velma A. "Adult Education: Where the Bread and Action Are." College Management 8 (April 1973): 9-14.

Boyer, Ernest L. and Keller, George C. "The Big Move to Non-Campus Colleges." Saturday Review 54 (17 July 1971): 46-49, 58.

Chronicle of Higher Education, 20 September 1976.

_____, 10 January 1977.

College and University Enrollment in New York State: Fall, 1976 (Preliminary Report). Albany: University of the State of New York, 1976.

Cross, K. Patricia. "The Instructional Revolution." In Individualizing the System, pp. 49-61. Edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Cross, K. Patricia, and Valley, John R. and Associates. Planning Non-Traditional Programs: An Analysis of the Issues of Postsecondary Education. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Corey, Stephen M. Action Research to Improve School Practices. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1953.

Digest of Educational Statistics, 1976 Edition. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1977.

Ewing, Wallace K. "Reshaping the Curriculum: What Does It Really Mean?" College and University 49 (Spring 1974): 96-113.

Gould, Samuel B. Diversity by Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Gould, Samuel B. and Cross, K. Patricia, ed. Explorations in Non-Traditional Study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Gross, Ronald. Higher/Wider/Education: A Report on Open Learning. New York: Ford Foundation, 1976.

Haberman, Martin. "New Entry Requirements and New Programs for College Students." In Policy Issues in Education, pp. 95-107. Edited by Allan C. Ornstein and Steven I. Miller. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1976.

Heydinger, Richard B. "The Assessment of Student Performance: A Model & the Reforms." Paper presented to the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois. 25 March 1975.

Houle, Cyril O. The External Degree. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Johnson, Jeffrey N. "Community Faculty in the University Without Walls at the University of Minnesota: A Preliminary Description." Alternative Higher Education 1 (Fall 1976): 5-13.

Kellams, Samuel E. "Knowledge Renewal with Innovation." College and University Journal 13 (May 1974): 5-8.

Knowles, Malcolm S. "Non-Traditional Study: Issues and Resolutions." Adult Leadership 23 (February 1975): 232-35.

Levine, Arthur, and Weingart, John. Reform of Undergraduate Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

London, Herbert I. "The Case for Nontraditional Education." Change 8 (June 1976): 25-29.

_____. "University Without Walls: Reform or Rip-Off?" Saturday Review 55 (16 September 1972): 62-65.

Nelson, Fred A. "Has the Time Gone for an External Degree?" Journal of Higher Education 45 (March 1974): 174-83.

Rex Reports: Newsletter of the Regents External Degrees. 2 (Summer 1977).

Schoemer, James R.; Thomas, James E.; and Bragonier, Wendell H. "A Study of the Effects of Non-Traditional Grades on Admission to Graduate School and the Awarding of Financial Assistance." College and University 48 (Spring 1973): 147-53.

Self Study in Progress Report. Cincinnati, Ohio: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1977.

Shulman, Carol H. "A Look at External Degree Structures." Research Currents. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, November, 1972.

Sosdian, Carol P., and Sharp, Laure M. The External Degree as a Credential: Graduates' Experiences in Employment and Further Study. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Splaver, Sarah. Nontraditional College Routes to Careers. New York: Juliam Messner, 1975.

Spurrs, Stephen H. Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches, Principles of Reform in Degree Structures in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Stecher, Carl A. "CLEP and the Great Credit Giveaway." Change 9 (March 1977): 36-41.

"Summary of Data, Study of Illinois Adult Learners, Presented to Board of Higher Education." Springfield, Ill.: Joint Education Committee of the Illinois Legislature, 1978. (Mimeographed.)

The Condition of Education, 1976. Washington, D.C.: National Center of Educational Statistics, 1976.

Trivett, David A. Competency Programs in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 7, 1974.

Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities. "Briefing Paper on UECU and UWW Prepared for the North Central Association Biennial Visit Evaluation Team." Yellow Springs, Ohio: October 1975. (Mimeographed.)

_____. University Without Walls: First Report. Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1972.

Willingham, Warren W. "Critical Issues and Basic Requirements for Assessment." In Experiential Learning, pp. 224-44. Edited by Morris Keeton and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Wrightstone, J. Wayne; Justman, Joseph; and Robbins, Irwing. Evaluation in Modern Education. New York: American Book Company, 1956.